

The Southern Standard.

W. D. GILMAN, Publisher and Proprietor.
J. R. SMITH, Editor.

ARTICLE TEST.—The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.—Federal Constitution.

COLUMBUS:

Saturday Morning, February 7, 1852.

TO ADVERTISERS:

THE SOUTHERN STANDARD has a weekly circulation twice as large as any paper published in this city. It is therefore the *cheapest* channel through which to convey information to the masses. Merchants and traders will find it to their advantage to give us a call, if they desire general publicity.

There is the finest assortment of Job Type in this establishment ever brought to this city, and we can execute, on short notice, all orders for work in all branches of our business.

Columbus, Miss., Oct. 18th, 1851.

Daguerrean Gallery.

Messrs. ROGERS & PALMER, have taken rooms in the City Hall, and offer their services to this community. We have examined their specimens, and for artistic skill, and beauty of finish, we regard them as far superior to any Daguerreotypes we have seen in our city. They exhibited specimens of Crayon finish, very beautiful, and in our opinion, exceedingly exquisite. It has the effect of bringing out prominently the features of the face, and it appears that a more perfect likeness is obtained in this style of finish.

We recommend our friends to call at the Hall, and examine the specimens.

We take pleasure in calling the attention of the public to the card of Dr. Penner, M. D., in another column of to-day's paper. The Doctor requires at the hands of no man public "puffs." His skill in scientific operations in this city, has purchased for him a name more enduring than any the press can give, and we have referred to his card more as an act of courtesy than with the view of "padding" him.

Our citizens are informed that there is a fine selection of literary, historical and scientific books on sale at the Auction Room of G. G. Moore. Those who want books, cards, letter paper, envelopes &c. &c., would do well to drop in some evening soon, and take a look at the quality, and learn the prices.

We are indebted to the Hon. J. A. Wilcox, for a pamphlet copy of Foote's two days speech upon his compromise finality resolution. We have followed Foote, step by step through his Senatorial career, and he has delivered no speech which appeared in the *Con. Globe*, that we have not read *once*, and many of his later efforts *twice*. We desired to know what he did say, how he said it, and how long he abided by what he said, and how often he had called upon his God to witness the sincerity of his purpose. But this last speech—the great speech as it has been announced by one of his admirers, is simply, taking it as a whole, or taking it by passages, without parallel, the most contemptible and ridiculous affair we have ever seen from him. He devotes two days to prove that Mr. Rhett, of S. C., is a disunionist. How ridiculous! Mr. Rhett does not deny it, that we know. He has announced his positions frequently to the world, and yet Senator Foote occupies the time of the Senate, and squanders the treasure of the country in such affairs.

It is now said at Washington that Fillmore has authorized his friends to submit his name to a Whig National Convention as a candidate for the Presidency. This, it is said, has sent Webster among his friends to enquire into the propriety of his resigning the Secretaryship of State.

Some think this will strengthen Gen. Scott before the convention, because Webster's friends will aid in defeating Fillmore with any man, and the influence of Webster and the Sewardites, will break down the silver greys at the North.

We have been requested by a committee from the I. O. O. Fellows, to give notice that Col. Joseph B. Cobb, in compliance with their invitation, will deliver a public lecture on Education in the Baptist Church, which has been kindly tendered for that purpose, on Wednesday evening next, at 7 o'clock. The citizens of Columbus must certainly feel the great importance of establishing a high Collegiate school in their midst. We are assured that the new board of Trustees are determined to secure the very best of Teachers and make a permanent school. They are competent and energetic men. Let the citizens turn out and hear what is to be done. The ladies are particularly invited to attend the Lecture. Col. Cobb is too well known as an elegant speaker, to require one word of commendation. L.

We will publish in our next issue a letter from the pen of Col. Jeff. Davis, in reply to some innuendoes made by Foote while at Washington, in some of his public addresses. This letter is rather a "tight paper," we may say it is very "tight" since it proves Foote guilty of stating matters the facts do not sustain in regard to Col. Davis. But we will give the letter in our next with a comment or two.

The last Mississippi states that the Legislature will not go into an election of Senator for the long term—the term commencing on the 4th March, 1853.

We shall have something to say about this matter hereafter, and take occasion to say now, that we are glad to learn that the Legislature has determined on this course. Give the people an opportunity to express preferences, freed from humbugs and the cry of disunion.

The Hon. J. J. McRea, A. G. Brown, and Jno. A. Wilcox, will accept our thanks, for copies of Rhett's, Houston's, Billy Smith's speech, and also, for a copy of proceedings and speeches delivered at the Kossuth Congressional Banquet.

Messrs. Cruse, Jack, and our old friend Cavanaugh, will accept our thanks for several public documents from Jackson.

The Hon. W. S. Featherston, the late M. D. from this Congressional district, and now the Democratic elector, was in our city in the early part of the week, on his way home from Jackson, where he had spent two or three weeks. The Colonel is in fine health, and speaks of the good cause in a most cheering manner.

The Vicksburg *Whig*, says there will be a Whig candidate for the Presidency, and urges its friends, and those of Federal Whiggery generally, to prepare for it. It says that Mississippi's voice ought to be heard in the selection of a suitable candidate. The difficulty will be, to find a suitable candidate in the ranks of the Northern Whigs—that's the rub.

Aberdeen Independent.

It is with a degree of deep mortification that we lay before the readers of the *Standard*, the response of the paper whose name heads this article, to the propositions we submitted to it, in our issue of the 24th ult. We had supposed that the proposed controversy was to have been commenced and conducted in a spirit of manly and dignified courtesy; that it was intended to be thorough, and that the history, as well as the leading arguments on both sides would be produced and exhausted, in the sustenance of the positions taken. This was and is our intention. If we cannot meet the opponents of secession, with history, and argument based upon historical facts, we shall never be little the cause we have espoused, by seeking to evade the issue by pleas and questions that better become the groveling demagogue and the sycophantic pettifogger, than the man who pretends to guide public opinion, and shape the course of party. Our only object is the elucidation of history, and the advancement of sound Republican doctrine. We have no object in view beyond this. Holding that a great and sacred principle had been assailed; knowing that the feeble points employed by its friends to sustain it had been ridiculed, and all that was historically important to the clear understanding of it had been suppressed by its opponents, we desired an opportunity through a press opposed to the justice of the principle to submit to its readers the facts and arguments by which it was sustained, together, with what could be urged against it. In one sense, the paper named above, met our views; it had assailed and ridiculed the doctrine of secession, and hence, through its columns we desired to be heard.

There is not a man in the State of Mississippi who is at all informed upon the question of secession, who does not know that the propositions suggested by us, are essential to a clear knowledge historically of the right for which we contend. There is not one who does not know that the successful defence of the right rests upon those questions, and that they must be discussed and adjusted, before argument can cover the whole ground. If the paper named above is not aware of this; if it believes that settlement of those propositions "begins before the beginning" of this disputed right—or that they are not the very pedestal upon which State Rights STANDS, we beg its pardon for having proposed the discussion; and we hope our readers will forgive us for having excited their curiosity. We had supposed that those who had lavishly ridiculed publicly, the right of secession, at least understood the arguments and history its advocates based its defence on. If, however, we are mistaken—and it seems we are—we appeal to a candid and enlightened public to say how far a press ought to be trusted, which attacks and ridicules a principle, the history of which it knows nothing, not nothing of the arguments by which it is sustained. It has been said a fool may confound a philosopher! Intending nothing personal in this, we are willing to believe the paper above named will see the propriety and justice, of meeting in a manly, frank and candid manner, the discussion tendered.

The paper named above, is decidedly mistaken in supposing that the questions "relate to the colonial principles of the British Constitution." They have no relation whatever, to the British Constitution. The first three questions are too direct to be evaded, and when any man says they "relate" to the "British Constitution," we must say that the relationship is very distant—so distant, that the man who so asserts, must have more "sand in his head," than "in his eyes." But to put all this to rest, we here republish the questions—let the world judge of the fairness of the opposition, and of the manliness of our opponent.

1st. Were not the Colonies, under the British domination separate States or governments?
2nd. Were not the Colonies wholly independent of one another in their entire political organization and administration, having no connecting tie but what they derived from being lieges of the British sceptre; and, in this respect, standing in the same relation to one another, as they did to Canada, Minorca, or any other of the dependencies of the British crown, except, in so far as the mere fact of proximity was concerned?

3rd. When the Colonies confederated to resist the exactions of the English Parliament, did they not form their coalition, frame their measures, perform their acts, on the principle of being separate States, each possessing its own distinct, independent polity, acting on the basis of its own free agency?
4th. When the Federal Constitution was formed, did not each State act for itself?—did not the people of each State, at the call of its own Legislature, meet on its own soil, within the bounds of its own territory, in its own primordial capacity, of an independent political community, possessing and exercising the attributes of original undivided sovereignty, the power the & will of political omnipotence, that power and that will which are antecedent and paramount to all political organizations and laws, the *primum et fons* whence governments imbibe their existence and life, did not the people of each State thus and there meet, and by their own several, sovereign act, adopt and ordain the Constitution, each for itself?

5th. Was the Constitution binding on any State, before the people of that State thus ordained it?
6th. As the word State is liable to be construed in three ways, let it be distinctly defined now, so as to prevent misconception or controversy hereafter.

1st. State may mean a certain tract of country, lying within certain boundaries, the habitation of a sovereign political community. This is State in its geographical sense.

2nd. State may mean the government—the civil organization, of such political community, existing and exercising authority over such territory—embracing the executive, legislative, judicial, and other functionaries, who are employed in effectuating the objects of such organization. This is State in its organized or government sense.

3rd. State may mean the people inhabiting and possessing such territory, considered in their first social condition in which all people exist antecedent to the formation of government, in which their will and welfare are the source, the centre and end of all power. This is State in its primitive and sovereign sense.

These questions, have nothing to do with the "British Constitution," and when the reader peruses the following, he may gather the value to be attached to those who denounce the doctrine of secession.

From the Aberdeen Independent.

Southern Standard's "No. 1."

"This Journal has commenced its dissertation on the 'abstract right of a State to secede' from the Union, to which we shall reply. In No. 1, it propounds various questions to us; but as it can doubtless substantiate its positions by better proof than our admissions, we respectfully decline to answer them. These questions relate to the colonial principles of the British Constitution; we are of opinion, that the discussion of questions so remote from that at issue, would only 'throw sand in the eyes' of its and our readers. True, we like to begin at the beginning; but we are not apprised of the propriety of beginning before the beginning. Possibly, there may be propriety in going back so far—and if the *Standard* chooses to eliminate the dark subject from the musty records of the past, we may yet be induced to have something to say upon it.

In conclusion, we desire the definition of 'secession'—we desire to see its history written. We desire to know its parentage and birth-place—its course of emigration, &c. We ask the definition of 'secession'—to know whether it is divisible or not—what is meant by *delegating* sovereignty, if it be divisible—and whether, if it can be, and is *delegated* or granted, it still remains with the grantor. We, also, desire to enquire, if the 10th article of the Constitution increases or strengthens the reserved rights of the States—the distinction between political and legal rights! Innumerable answers at once suggest themselves, and they are some commonplace, that we dare not encroach upon the intelligence of our readers in enumerating them. If an answer is again pressed, we shall decline sheltering the ignorance of those who propound it, by remaining silent.

The last question is, "what is meant by the 'last resort'?" We answer, "secede," "secession," or withdrawing from fellowship, which ever you please. After having exhausted all legitimate remedies of redress, the "last resort," is secession—separation.

We have now answered every question with one exception propounded. We shall shun no question in its legitimate place, coming up in the order of discussion. It is our desire to throw light on the doctrine of secession, and it will afford us pleasure, to explain any point, answer any question, at that point in our argument where either are legitimate. We cannot be provoked into a rambling discussion. We move from the beginning, and bring our historical facts and arguments down, step by step, side by side, so that he who runneth may read and understand.

The questions we have propounded, and again republish to-day, are presented in order to obtain an affirmative or denial. History decides upon five of them, and the sixth, with its corollary, is the mere defining of the word "State." It is often used in the various forms indicated, and we wished an arbitrary sense adopted at the outset, so that no verbal quibbling about its true signification could happen hereafter.

Again, the denial or admission of each of the first five propositions, at some point of the controversy is inevitable, and our opponent can gain nothing by declining to answer them now, by a simple denial or an affirmative. His declining to answer leaves us without any knowledge of what he has to prove, because we do not know what he will affirm or what he will deny. We both may affirm, or deny the same proposition, and it will be seen by all our readers, that little credit is due either. The first five propositions are historically true, or they are not historically true—if true they can be proved so, if not true, they cannot be so proved—history decides the point, if we should disagree, and who can say shall.

A refusal to answer the propositions will be regarded by every intelligent man, as an inglorious retreat from the field of controversy—a retreat without palliation or respectable excuse of any kind. We shall await a response to the propositions, with the confident belief that our opponent will take a less narrow view of the subject matter before our readers.

Whiggery and Democracy.

There are two sorts of Whiggery and two sorts of Democracy in this world. As we have an idle hour now we will devote it to explaining the difference between Whiggery and Democracy, and as our hand is in, we will draw the lines so distinct, that no man can misunderstand us. We distinctly state now, that no honest man will contend for a name, unless that name is the representative of some substantive fact or principle. What matters it whether a man be called a Whig or a Democrat. The name is nothing, but the principle the name is intended to represent or signify, is everything. Shakespeare says that a rose would smell as sweet by any other name. This is true. Suppose you call a whig a traitor, does that make him a traitor? Surely not. Suppose you call a democrat a traitor, does it make him so? These simple illustrations are understood by all, and are introduced for a direct purpose.

The Alien and Sedition laws passed under the administration of old John Adams. It is known that he was a high toned Federalist—that he believed in a strong government—such a government as Hamilton favored—one partaking of many of the features of the British Government, and some of these, of the most objectionable character. The Alien law, clothed the President with fearful powers. Upon suspicion he had the power to arrest a foreigner, one who may have been years a resident in the country, and send him off. He was the prosecutor, and in various senses, the judge. The Sedition law was not less offensive. It struck at the freedom of the Press, and the right of every freeman to speak or write his thoughts freely, both in regard to the policy pursued by government, and those who were called upon to administer it. It prohibited newspaper editors from bringing the political acts of their servants before the bar of public opinion. This, it was said, stirred up sedition, aided the rebellious, and brought the laws of the land, and their administrators, into contempt.

Mr. Jefferson said that both of these laws were unconstitutional. Mr. Adams said they were constitutional. Mr. Jefferson drew up, and caused to be presented to the Legislature of Kentucky, the famous resolutions, now known as the KENTUCKY RESOLUTIONS of 1798—we republished them on the 24th ult, as part of the proceedings of the Democratic Convention of the 5th of January.

Mr. Madison sustained Mr. Jefferson, and drew up the famous resolutions known now as the VIRGINIA RESOLUTIONS of 1798, and had them presented to the Virginia Legislature, a copy of which we published as noted above.

Both States acted upon the resolutions. This was the first great struggle between a State and the Federal Government. The resolutions asserted the Rights of the States, and under the lead of Jefferson and Madison the Republican or Democratic party was formed. During the Revolution there were two parties, Whig and Tory. It is now believed that the Tories of the Revolution, still clinging to the idea of a strong government, and to the notion that the People were incapable of self-government, joined with the old Federalists, in defence of the Alien and Sedition laws, taking sides with the Federal against the State governments, with the view of centralizing power, thus building up on this continent, a Representative Monarchy. The Whigs of the Revolution, held distinct doctrine; they perilled all upon the intelligence of the people; they believed in the sagacity, the patriotism, the virtue of the masses—they denounced classes—and orders, and opposed all titles of nobility. This was the creed of the ancient Whigs—the Whigs of the Revolution, and when the Federal government under the lead of old John Adams, commenced a war upon the State governments, and carried its hostility against a Republican form of government to the extent of striking at the freedom of the Press, and the liberty of the foreigner who had sought our shores to escape the tyranny of the old world, they rallied to the standard of State Rights, under the principles inscribed upon the Republican flag of 1798-9. Thomas Jefferson and James Madison headed the State Rights party—The old Republican Whig party, the party of the Revolution.

The Resolutions of 1798-9 contained the creed of the Republican Whig party, and they were construed by Mr. Madison, Jefferson, and others, and were understood by those who adopted, as well as those who defended them, as asserting the Right of each State to "judge for itself, as well of the infractions as of the mode and measure of redress." That is, that a State has the right to secede or withdraw from the Union for just cause. This was the construction, and Kentucky and Virginia, acting in obedience to this construction, took prompt and efficient steps to enforce it, if it became necessary. About 1800, the Republican Whig party adopted as its *nom de plume* the word Democrat, as

being more significant and expressive. Thus the old Revolutionary name of Whig, with the Principles belonging to it, passed into and became a part of the Principles of the Party baptised under the name of Democrat, and under the shadow of Madison's, and Jefferson's great popularity, the name at once became significant, its principles widely spread, took deep and abiding hold upon the confidence of the people, they were then engrafted upon the policy of the government, and preserved the liberty of the States and the people.

Mr. Jefferson was at once put forward for the Presidency, and his creed, the Resolutions of Virginia & Kentucky, became the point of attack. The Federalists, defended the Alien and Sedition laws, opposed the Resolutions of 1798-9, as traitorous doctrine. Mr. Jefferson with the Democratic Republican party succeeded—he was elected President. This was the Death warrant of Federalism. That party struggled a few years, under its old name, to sustain its Consolidating and Centralizing principles, but it wholly failed, in order to succeed, it Appropriated the name of Whig, and endeavored to deceive the country that it was the old Revolutionary Whig party revived. But the trick was too palpable, the people rebuked it by re-electing Mr. Jefferson. The people saw in Jefferson, the principles of the Old Revolutionary Whig party, Embodied, and they were neither to be deceived by a name, nor bought at the price of sacrificing the independence and sovereignty of the States.

The effort to appropriate the name of Whig by the Federalists was several times subsequently attempted. During the war of 1812, the name of Federalist was again revived. The spirit of the old Tories was manifested by the "blue-lights" along the Atlantic coast, becoming the British war ships, and showing the British seamen, that friends and succor were near. It was to fight under the banner of the stars and stripes, that a traitor heart and a cowardly hand, guided those "blue-lights," and that there were men on the American soil, capable of selling their birth-right, and their country's liberty to a foreign power.

Another attempt to appropriate the name of Whig was made, and succeeded under John Q. Adams. It was temporary—that is, the success—for the people very soon hurled them from power, and replaced the Principles of '98-9 in the ascendant, and gave their exponents paramount position in the government.

In 1830-1-2-3, the doctrine of Jefferson and Madison was questioned in high places. Mr. Webster became the Senatorial organ of the Federal construction. It is now a matter of history, that Webster was a prominent actor in the Hartford convention, and that the system of beaconing and "blue-lighting" British ships along our coast, derived support and defence at the hands of the Hartford convention men. Mr. Webster was, in consequence of those circumstances, put forward in the Senate, to battle down, and explain away, the Resolutions of Madison and Jefferson. His explanation became the creed of the Union party in '32-3. Upon that explanation, with various shades of reservations and constructions, all the Tories and the Federalists at once flung themselves, and under the name of Union party they organized. Under this distinct organization, they fought Hayne, Calhoun, and that glorious host of State Rightmen, who led on the van in 1831-2-3.

We have thus brought the names of Whig and Democrat down to recent date. We have shown that the Federalists and Tories, after Jefferson and Madison had dropped the name Whig, and substituted that of Democrat, appropriated it—used it for a season and took up Republican Whig, and then again abandoned the Republican prefix, holding the name of Whig alone. It is noticeable, however, that the abandonment of the old Federal and Tory principles has never happened, and that on the contrary, they have ever abided with them, under all changes of name, and that what is now known as the Union, is the old Federal party with all its odious heresies. We have found it under old John Adams—at a later period headed by Webster at Hartford—at a later period by John Q. Adams and Webster, and now it is headed by such men as Webster, Cass, Donelson, Cobb and Foote. The last four men named call themselves Democrats. They are Tories or Federalists in principle. They adopt Webster's construction, and that is Federal, consolidating, and centralizing. Therefore, when we speak of THE WHIG PARTY, we speak of that party now known as Union, or FEDERAL, or FOOTE, or DONELSON party—a miserable humbug party—a party that denies the sovereignty of a people of a State—a party which insists that the Federal government may coerce a State by the force of arms—a party that contends that the Federal government may by its armed soldiery and hiring myrmidons, throttle, butcher, and gibbet the citizens of a State, who are but obeying the laws of its own community within its recognized limits. No whig of 1776 contends for such monstrous doctrines. It is the Tory Federalist assumed the name of Whig for the purpose of deception. It is not the name then that divides us. It was the name alone, how could we fellowship with such men as T. J. Stewart, T. J. Word, J. I. Guion, J. W. Thompson, W. L. Harris, C. R. Clifton, and a host of such men. They saw at once, that the Madison and Jefferson construction of the Virginia and Kentucky resolutions was adhered to by over three fourths of what was formerly known as the Democratic party, and that if that held fast to principle, and the Rights of the States—principles they had never abandoned, and rights they had ever maintained—that they must fight with the True Democracy, the Democracy of Jefferson and Madison, and NOT THE DEMOCRACY of Gov. Foote, Gov. Cobb, Mr. Donelson of the Washington Union, &c. &c.

They did not hesitate a moment in choosing between a Name and a Principle. They adhered to the Principle and do not care a snap by what Name they are known. Sure of the substance, it is of no moment as to what the name may be.

The *Standard* adheres to the Madison and Jefferson construction of the Resolutions of '98-9. It gives its support to Party in so far as Party stands in defence of and asserts principle. If the Party with which we now act should yield on this point, the *Standard* would de-
—once it as base and cowardly. Southern Rights and State Rights are nearly identical. The former we believe can only be sustained by asserting and defending the latter. But rather than yield up the former, we would aid in sweeping the Union of States from existence. This is our creed of Democracy.

But are we alone? No. Every old Democratic press in this State but one, is with us. The same is the case in Alabama, with one or two exceptions. In the Old Dominion—the mother of States, and the land of Madison, Jefferson, Pendleton, Tazewell, Mason, and a galaxy of talent that no single State has produced in its State, is State Rights, Democratic State Rights! They all adopt the construction of Madison and Jefferson, the same construction that Col. Davis and others in this State now give those Resolutions. Now, who are the Federalists? Having shown that about three fourths of the modern Whigs are with Foote and his party, and that he is aided by a few Federal Democrats, we answer that all who sustain Foote, Cobb, and the Washington Union, we care not what the name they may be designated by, are Federalists in principle.

The State Rights Whig should never consider himself alluded to when we speak of the Whigs. There is just the same difference between a State Rights Whig and a Federal Whig, as there is between a State Rights Democrat and a Federal Democrat. The difference is radical. We stated at the outset, that there were two sorts of whiggery and two sorts of Democracy, we think we have proven it.

Whig and a Federal Whig, as there is between a State Rights Democrat and a Federal Democrat. The difference is radical. We stated at the outset, that there were two sorts of whiggery and two sorts of Democracy, we think we have proven it.

We publish to-day the resolutions Mr. Clarke, of R. I., introduced into the U. S. Senate, also those of Mr. Cass and Seward. It is not intended to discuss the doctrines of the resolutions, and we publish them with the view of saying a few words in regard to Cass, his late and present position, and his probable course in regard to these resolutions.

The Cass Nicholson letter of 1848, is well remembered, and the construction placed upon that letter by Southern politicians is a matter of record. It is known he availed himself of the advantages of that construction by remaining silent, and also of a different construction given to it at the North. He forfeited the respect of every man who contends for a high and pure political moral standard. He suffered his friends to delude the people, not so much for political effect, as for sectional purposes.

The intervention doctrine of the resolution, and the speech before the Kossuth Congressional banquet, (as so published to-day) convinces us that he is shaping his course with the view of reaping the benefit of another double position. He is spreading his net for a re-connoissance for the Presidency, and he is satisfied he has but little hope of Southern support, and can succeed alone by bringing the great West up for him as a single unit. Intervention is vastly popular in the West. Among an agricultural people such doctrines find hearty response and approbation. Cass will win his course so as to secure the West; he is protective tariff enough for the East; is anti-slavery enough for the New England States, and he will leave his course of intervention so indefinitely defined as to admit of two constructions.

What political honesty would be combined in such a ticket as this—what moral power it would exercise at home and abroad, and what an administration it would be, should the people elevate them to power.

For President,

LEWIS CASS, of Mich.

For Vice President,

HENRY S. FOOTE, of Miss.

This may be the ticket of the Baltimore convention—things less likely have happened, and may happen again.

To our readers at a distance, who may be looking for Legislative proceedings, we will remark that up to this time, the greater portion of them may be comprised in the word *Luncheon*—Jackson Star.

So far, this Legislature has accomplished less than any preceding one ever convened in this State—it is a Union snap.

Mr. J. P. Benjamin, an able lawyer and prominent whig in the city of N. Orleans, has been elected to the U. S. Senate, in the place of Gen. Down, one of the campaign supporters, and Foote's tool. We are glad of this; we desire to see all of the agitators displaced and sent into retirement.

Mr. Clingman of N. C. offered the following to House of Representatives the other day. It was moved to suspend the rules, the yeas and nays demanded. "Whereas, some of the States of the Union have, in their Constitutions, provided for the absolute exclusion of free negroes from their several Territories, while others have sought to obtain the same object by legislation; and whereas complaints have at times been made of these things by other States and nations: Therefore,

Resolved, That in the opinion of the House of Representatives, it is the unquestionable right of each one of the States of the Union to exclude, either wholly or partially, from her territory, negroes, whether free or slaves; and that the exercise of this right affords no just ground of complaint to any other State or States."

The move was voted down yeas 69, nays 85.

The following is from the Washington correspondent of the Charleston *Standard*:

The impression is gaining ground here that the doctrine which Kossuth has been preaching, interfering in European affairs to prevent intervention, will form a material issue in the next Presidential election. If this opinion should be correct, several of the prominent candidates now will stand no chance then in the South, for it is there that the conservatism of this government must be found, or the ship will be wrecked on the shoals of "socialism and progress."

The continent of Europe is at the present time calm, but the dead calm in the physical world is not unfrequently the precursor of the appalling storm and the situation of its affairs now cannot be contemplated without the most intense interest. The only considerable republic in Europe was France. She had her Constitution and Chamber of Deputies, and in defence of all law, her President seizes the reins of Government, abrogates the Constitution, and casts into a cheerless dungeon all who oppose his usurpation, and with an army of more than 100,000 soldiers to back him, he insolently refers the very question of usurpation to the French nation to be decided by their votes, and is elected by the very people whom he has wronged and outraged by abrogating their Government. President for ten years!! and that too by a majority of near seven millions, when only eight millions of votes were polled. Now, strange to say, upon his life depends the peace of all continental Europe, including perhaps, England, too. If he were to die, or be assassinated, what would be the result? The French army which he marched to Italy some three years ago to subdue republicanism there and restore the exiled Pope to his lost dominions, would return to France. The republicans of Italy would at once renew their war against the Pope. When the ball was started, Hungary would revive her revolution; this would bring into the arena Austria and Russia, and perhaps, Prussia, and who can tell where the end would be. All these results depending on the life of a single man!!

A Good, Brave Toast.

At the Congressional banquet given to Kossuth, the second toast was—*The Judiciary of the United States*—The expounders of the Constitution and the bulwark of Liberty, regulated by law.

Judge Wayne, of the Supreme Court, responded, simply returning thanks for the compliment, and giving the following sentiment:

Constitutional Liberty to all nations of the Earth—Supported by Christian faith and the morality of the Bible.

Judge Wayne's toast is the noblest sentiment we recollect having seen among all the toasts which have been brought out by the diners in honor of Kossuth. It may be well incorporated into every Christian patriot's prayer. Give the nations of the earth Constitutional liberty, without the support of the Christian faith and the morality of the Bible, and you give them no blessing at all. Liberty is no boon to men who cannot govern themselves.

The tendency of Kossuth's speeches has been in a high degree favorable to the advance of the great truth. His own mind seems to be deeply imbued with the Protestant religious sentiment, and being a bold, good man, he speaks what he thinks. He feels the need of the Bible and the preached gospel for his own country. Hence the Roman Catholics hate him with perfect hatred. They do not want the Bible. It is more fatal to despotism than cannon or sword. Popery loves